



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,143	06/29/2001	Jason Benfield	AUS920010376US1	8313
7590	09/27/2004		EXAMINER	
Joseph R. Rurwell Law office of Joseph R. Burwell P.O. Box 28022 Austin, TX 78755-8022			GECKIL, MEHMET B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/895,143	BENFIELD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mehmet B. Geckil	2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-53 are presented for examination.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grau et al.
5. Grau et al (5,910,803) taught the invention substantially as claimed (e.g., as in the exemplary claim 1) including a system apparatus and method for management of a distributed data processing system, the method comprising:

- a) associating a set of logical networks in the distributed data processing system and/or a set of physical networks in the distributed data processing system with an anchor object or AtlasAnchor object (col 4, line 7 et seq; col 8, lines 25-61; col 9, line 7 et seq and col 9, line 52 et seq, e.g., AtlasLinkReference object);
- b) generating a topology map (Figure 6, col 7, lines 66-67; col 8, line 1 et seq; col 9, line 12 et seq and finally col 12, line 29 et seq, e.g. using tree browser); and
- c) displaying the topology map (col 5, line 12 et seq.)

6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the network topology map creation art at the time of the invention that the claimed invention differed from the teachings of Grau et al only by a degree, e.g., in the claimed root node of the topology map is the anchor object. Grau et al taught an atlas map, i.e., a combination of individual network maps displayed on the display window. Each map included a root node of that particular topology of that particular LAN or WAN (see col 12 line 30 et seq, and col 9, line 20 et seq.) Dependent claims recite various features of user or customer customization of the topology map but Grau et al also taught generating customized maps according to user specification (see col 10, line 57 et seq and col 11, line 57 et seq) as well as hierarchical tree view (col 12, line 29 et seq.) Other claimed elements are all obvious variations of the well known features of topology mapping based on object oriented systems.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mehmet Geckil whose telephone number is (703) 305-

9676. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 A.M. to 3:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Jack Harvey, can be reached on (703) 305-9705. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are listed hereinbelow.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700. Customer service number is (703) 306-5631.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

9/22/04



MEHMET B. GECKIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

BEST AVAILABLE COPY